

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria. Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,140	05/03/2001	Hideyo Osanai	134.136	7450
75	90 06/19/2006		EXAM	INER
JAMES H. PATTERSON			DINH, TUAN T	
PATTERSON,	THUENTE, SKAAR & C	HRISTENSEN, P.A.		
4800 IDS CENT	ΓER	,	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
80 SOUTH 8TH	I STREET		2841	
MINNEAPOLIS	S, MN 55402-2100			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

, A	pplication No.	Applicant(s)					
·		,					
_	9/848,140	OSANAI ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	xaminer	Art Unit					
	uan T. Dinh	2841					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear Period for Reply	rs on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will a - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cau Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing dat earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	E OF THIS COMMUNICATIO). In no event, however, may a reply be ti pply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron Ise the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed in the mailing date of this communication ED (35 U.S.C. & 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 April</u>	2006.						
<u> </u>	tion is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex p	parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7 and 23-34</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7 and 23-34</u> is/are rejected.	⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7 and 23-34</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.)☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or el	ection requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction			(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	iner. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign pri a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	ority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents ha							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority		ed in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (P	* **						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of t	he certified copies not receive	ed.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	attitivippiioddoir (i 10-102)					

DETAILED ACTION

Noted of the claimed language:

<u>intended use limitation</u>. The claim limitation that employ phrases of the type "adapted to" is typical of claim limitation which may not distinguish over prior art according to the principle. It has been held that the recitation that <u>an element is "adapted to" perform or is "capable of being"</u> performing a function is not a positive limitation but only requires

Claim Objections

1. Claims 23-24 are objected to because of the following informalities:

the ability to so perform, see In re Venezia, 189 USPQ (CCPA 1976).

Claim 23, line 5, is unclear. The phrase of "a ceramic substrate of planar plate" is not understood. Does applicant mean of "a ceramic substrate formed of a planar plate or a ceramic substrate is formed on the planar plate"?

Please, clarify.

Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 09/848,140 Page 3

Art Unit: 2841

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 23-24, 26-27, and 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (U. S. Patent 4,531,044) in view of Baba et al. (U. S. Patent 4,284,437), and further in view of Edwards et al. (U.S. Patent 5,650,662).

As to claims 1, 4-6, Chang disclose a metal-ceramic circuit board as shown in figures 3 and 8 comprising

a aluminum alloy base plate (16, column 4, line 9) and a ceramic substrate board (15, column 4, line 5) made of alumina (column 4, lines 23-29), wherein one surface (a bottom surface) of the ceramic substrate board (15) is bonded directly to the aluminum base plate (16), see figure 3, the aluminum base plate (16) having a thickness not smaller than 1mm, see column 4, lines 32-34.

Chang does not disclose the aluminum alloy base plate having a proof stress not higher than 320Mpa.

Baba et al. show a aluminum alloy base plate having a proof stress not higher than 320Mpa, see column 4, lines 22-42, column 7, line 8, and also, see tables 2 and 6.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a proof stress (yielding strength) not higher than 320Mpa of a aluminum/aluminum alloy base plate in the metal-ceramic circuit board of Chang,

as taught by Baba et al., in order to provide a maximum deflection and anti breaking strengths of the metal base of the circuit board.

Chang and Baba do not show the ceramic substrate bonded directly to the base plate without any intervening material.

Edward et al. teach a technique of direct bonding between a heat spreader (16) and a ceramic layer (22) of a substrate (14) as shown in figures 1-4 without any intervening material therebetween, column 4, lines 48-65.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a teaching of Edwards employ the circuit board of Chang and Baba in order to direct transfer heat.

As to claim 2, Chang disclose the board as shown in figures 3 and 8 wherein the other surface (a top surface) of the ceramic substrate board (15) has a metal conductive member (14, column 4, lines 4-5).

As to claims 7 23-24, 26, Chang disclose a module (column 1, line 57) as shown in figures 3 and 8 comprising

a aluminum alloy base plate (16),

a ceramic substrate board (15), and the base plate (16) having an area larger than the substrate board (15)

a semiconductor tip (14), wherein one surface of the ceramic substrate (15) board is bonded directly to the base plate (16), said semiconductor tip (14) is provided on the other surface of said ceramic substrate board (15), the aluminum base plate (16) having a thickness not smaller than 1mm, see column 4, lines 32-34.

Chang does not disclose the aluminum alloy base plate having a proof stress not higher than 320Mpa.

Baba et al. show a aluminum alloy base plate having a proof stress not higher than 320Mpa, see column 4, lines 22-42, column 7, line 8, and also, see tables 2 and 6.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a proof stress (yielding strength) not higher than 320Mpa of a aluminum/aluminum alloy base plate in the metal-ceramic circuit board of Chang, as taught by Baba et al., in order to provide a maximum deflection and anti breaking strengths of the metal base of the circuit board.

Chang and Baba do not show the ceramic substrate bonded directly to the base plate without any intervening material.

Edward et al. teach a technique of direct bonding between a heat spreader (16) and a ceramic layer (22) of a substrate (14) as shown in figures 1-4 without any intervening material therebetween, column 4, lines 48-65.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a teaching of Edwards employ the circuit board of Chang and Baba in order to direct transfer heat.

As to claim 27, Chang discloses the base plate made of aluminum alloy acts as a heat sink.

As to claims 29-34, Chang and Baba disclose the circuit or the power module adapted to withstand a thermal cycle test of at least 1000 or 3000 times.

4. Claims 3, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang ('044), Baba et al. ('437), and Edwards ('662) as applied to claims 1-2, and 4-7 above, and further in view of Nagase et al. (U. S. Patent 6,033,787).

Chang, Baba, and Edwards disclose all of the limitations of the claimed invention, except for the conductive member made by a material selected from copper/copper alloy, and aluminum/aluminum alloy.

Nagase et al. shows a metal conductive member (11) made of aluminum material bonded on a ceramic substrate (13), see figure 1.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a metal conductive member made of aluminum on the substrate of Chang, Baba, and Edwards, as taught by Nagase et al. for the purpose of improving a thermal conductivity and heat resistance.

5. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Baba and Edwards as applied to claims 23-27, and 22-24 above, and further in view of Prior Art (submitted by applicant, figure 5).

Regarding claim 28, Chang, Baba, and Edwards do not specific disclose the conductive member bonded on the surface of the substrate board by using a brazing material.

APA-figure 5 shows a conductive member (8) bonded on a substrate board (2) by using a brazing material.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a teaching of APA employed in the circuit board of Chang, Baba, and Edwards in order to provide a flexure for the circuit board without damaging components mounted on the board.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, and 23-34 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues:

The combination of Chang, Baba, and Edwards fails to disclose all of the limitations of the claimed invention (for example, claims 1 and 7).

Examiner disagrees because Chang discloses the ceramic substrate (15) board is bonded to the surface of the aluminum base plate (16), the aluminum base plate (16) having a thickness not smaller than 1mm (<u>means greater than 1 mm</u>), see column 4, lines 32-34.

Baba teaches aluminum alloy sheet having a thickness of 2 mm having a proof stress not higher than 320Mpa (means less than 320Mpa), see column 4, lines 27-42.

Since Chang had the thickness of the aluminum plate being greater than 1 mm, it can be 2 or more than 2 mm. Thus, the teaching of Baba to conclude the properties of the aluminum sheet or plate having a thickness of 2 mm falls in a range of less than 320Mpa that prove the Chang reference can have the proof stress of less than 320Mpa with in a range of 2 mm.

Art Unit: 2841

Therefor the combination of Chang in view of Baba is proper.

Edwards teaches a direct bonded of a metal base plate (16) to a portion (20) of a ceramic substrate (14) without any intervening material. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a teaching of Edwards employ the circuit board of Chang in order to direct transfer heat.

Thus, in the explanation as above, the examiner believes the combination is proper.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan T. Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-1929. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kammie Cuneo can be reached on 571-272-1957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/848,140

Page 9

Art Unit: 2841

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tuan Dinh

June 06, 2006.